ensy.-WEEKLY, (published tri-weekly during the session of Congress)......

Five copies of the DAILY, for Five copies of the SEMI-WEEKLY....

Clubs will be furnished as follows:

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 27, 1856.

Proposals for Erecting the Custom-house, &c., at Plattsburgh, New York.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, December 10, 1856

DROPOSALS will be received at this department until the 18th I day of February, A. D. 1807, at 12 o clock, moon, for the construction of the custom-bosse, post office, and court-rooms authorized to be exceeded a Plattbudergh, New York, according to the plans and specifications prepared at this department; said proposals to better for the whole building, or separate for the different kinds of work; thills of parcels must in every case accompany each bid, with the amount of each kind of work, and the tonia amount carried out; the department reserving the right to reject or accept the proposals hereby invited, or any parts thereof, when it deems the interest of the United State requires it; the department also reserves the right to exclude the bids of any persons represent whom there is

will not be received in gross, and no contract will be award a bidger unless details are furnished the department of the of the different kines of work and materials, which shall be to the revision of the d-partment, so that it may adopt the or part of the bid, as the interest of the United States may re

y per cent, of the amount of work done and materials de

ance of the work, &c, by the agent abbreaus, and be sortened-te syent of non-fulfilment of contract.

outracts will be awarded only to in-stee builders and mechan-and the assignment thereof, except by consent of the Secretary,
ter Treasury, will be a forfoiture of the same.

ten proposal must be accompanced by a written guarantee, signby two responsible persons, (certified to be so by the United
ea district judge or attorney of the said district,) in the sum of
60, for the whole work, or of a proportionate amount, if for
part, that the bidder will, when required, if his proposal be aced, enter into a contract and bond, with proper and sufficient setest for its faithful performance.

orm of bond and certificate required will be furnished on applint to the decorament.

Plans speciment.

Pith of January, when they can be had on approximately partition.

M. Mdw il be considered unless it fully complies in all its details so that the requirem rate of the advertisement.

The proposals must be sent to this department, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, and plining endorsed "Proposals for the Platticke gh Custom-house," and will be opened at one o'clock, p. Platticke gh Custom-house," and will be opened at one o'clock, p. JAMES GUTHRIE, ...

JAMES GUTHRIE, Secretary of the Treasury.

Proposals for Erecting the Cu-tom-House, &c.,

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

PROPOSALS will be received at this department until the 12th day of February, A. D. 1-57, at 12 o'clock, noon, for he construction of the custom-house, post office, and cour-rooms authorized to be erected at Ga veston Texas, according to the plans and specifications prepared at this department; said proposals to be either for the whole building, or sejarate for the sterent kinds of work billies of purcels must in every case accompany each bid, with the

will be awarded only to manufacture of the Secretary of pument thereof, except by consent of the Secretary of f, will be a forfeiture of the same.

the bidder will, when it the bidder will, when it into a contract and bond, with propose into a contract and bond, with propose is a faithful performance. Form of bond and certificate a faithful performance for instead, together with plans, specifications, and working drawings, on application to the inpurpose. And it is detailed with the requirements of this advertisement.

No bid will be considered universe is fully complies in all its details with the requirements of this advertisement.

The proposals must be sent to this department, addressed to the secretary of the Treasury, and planing endorsed "Proposals for the Secretary of the Treasury, and planing endorsed "Proposals for the Galvesion Custom house," and will be opened at one o'clock, p.m., Galvesion Custom house," and will be opened at one o'clock, p.m., Galvesion Custom house, "Bangs Gutthers, Jangs Gutthers, and day named for receiving the same.

JAMES GUTHER, Secretary of the Treasury.

Office of Egerton & Brother,

NOVEL LOTTERY.

Mappiand lottery, to be drawn on the Havana plan.

GRAND CONSOLIDATED LOTTERY OF MARYLAND,

EXTRA CLASS SEVER,

To be drawn in Baltimore city on Saturday, Dec. 20, 1856.

Eas amounting to § 32,600 will be destributed according to the
following splendid soleme:

20,000 numbers—1,000 prizes.

Prizes navable in full, without deduction. Prizes payable in full, without dedu One prize to every twenty tickets

9,000 1,500 1,500 1,500 1,000 1,000 1,000 APPROXIMATION PRIZES. 4 prizes of \$150 approx. to \$40,000 prizes are. 4 prizes of 100 a prox. to 14,900 prizes are. 4 prizes of 90 approx. to 10,000 prizes are. 5,000 prizes are. 5,000 prizes are. 3,040 prizes are. 2,000 prizes are. 1,500 prizes are. 1,0 0 prizes are. 200 prizes are. 2 prizes of

Tickets \$10-haives \$5-quarters \$2 50. Prizes paid in full, without deduc All orders addressed to us will be considered as strice

al, and meet with an answer by return of mail.

Notes of all good banks taken at par. Address
EGE(10) A BOTHER, Reguist Licensed Agents,
Box 103 Baitimore Post Office, Baltimore, Maryland.

IMPORTANT TO COTTON PLANTERS. By which their incomes must be doubled

By which their incomes must be doubled,
THE undersigned has invented and obtained letters patent from the
United States for the arrangement and combination of machinety for converting seed coutton into yarns by one continuous process,
from the gin through the various preparation and a inning machine
ry, until it is ready for shipment or weaving.

The saving from wants by this process will be at least ten per cent,
and yarns saids from the fibre (unbroken and uniquared by the operrations of the machinery of the present process used to open and disentangle (i) will be about fifty per cent, stronger and heavier, and
will commend the markets of the world, distancing all competition
at advanced prices.

will commind the markets of the worse, measurement of advanced prices.

The undersign-d is prepared to dispose of privileges to use his patent; and planters will be informed as to terms, with complete in structions how to use it, how to o-tain the best machinery, and all other necessary particulars, on application addressed to the necessary particulars, on application addressed to Dec 6—6xwlyif

WHY will ye die when Madam Mount's Consumption

stroyer is at hand. A newer-failing cure, if continued the same is broken up. Also a sovereign remedy for colds, croup, phithi-fo, and bronchitis. Numbers in this place can testive virtue of this simp. It can be had at No. 339 G street, a lith and luth, or at \$80st's apothecary, corner of 7th and

may be obtained at the seminary and at the principal

REFERENCES REV. G. D. Cummins, Ractor Triolity Church, WashingtonHon. W. W. deston, Washington,
Hon. As Riggs, United Sintes cenate.
Hon. J. A. re-res,
Hon. J. A. re-res,
Hon. B. R. Curist, United States Supreme Court.
Hon. B. R. Curist, United States Supreme Court.
Hon. W. W. Holyce, House of Representatives,
Hon. Bayard Clar.
Hon. Bayard Clar.
Ri. Rev. A. Potter, D. D., Rishop of Penneyivania.
Rt. Rev. C. P. Mellvaine, D. D., Bishop of Ohio.
Rev. C. M. Butler, D. D., Cincinnati.
Dec. 9—diff

Willards' Hotel. J. C. & H. A. WILLARD, Pennsylvania arenue and Fourteenth street, Washington, D. C.

PARKERS Fancy Comb and Perfumery Store, under Nati

CONGRESSIONAL.

SPEECH OF HON. GEO. W. JONES, OF TENNESSEE,

On the question of referring the President's message to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and the printing of ten thousand copies thereof; delivered in the House of Representatives December 16, 1856.

the House of Representatives December 16, 1856.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, said:

The question in issue between the democratic party of the country and the abolitionized wing of the know nothing party, under the name of black republicans, in the late presidential contest, was as to the power of this government, and its exercise over the Territories of the United States. This has been the question between the northern anti-slavery portion of the confederacy and the democratic party from the organization of this government down to the present time. And, sir, while this question has frequently been before Congress, it has never been here but it has caused agitation and excitement throughout the country.

out the country.

There have been what are called compromises; the two most nemorable of which were passed in 1820 and 1850 But, Mr. Spraker, there has never been a compromise between the democratic party and your party—the anti-stavery men of the North. Whatever of compromise and slavery men of the North. Whatever of compromise and concession has been had upon this question has been on the part of the democratic party, to get on to some ground upon which we, the constitutional party, could agree to administer the government. The two parties in the late canvass were at direct issue upon this question. The republican party laid it down as their fundamental creed on this subject, that "the constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government; and that, in the exercise of this power, it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit, in the Territories, those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery." Where, sir, I would ask, is the overeign power to be found in the constitution of the United States? I deny its existence. It cannot be found in that clause which provides that—

"Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all

"Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make al needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory of other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice and claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

In this constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

It is unnecessary to go into an argument to show that in this connexion territory is but a synonymous term for land; that this clause confers on Congress the power to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the public land of the government. I hold that under that clause Congress has the same power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the public land within a State that it has within a Territory; and whether in a State or in a Territory, when the government sells land and vests the title in the purchaser, Congress executes all the power it has under that clause of the constitution. It has no more power to make rules and regulations respecting that land. Where, then, does Congress get the power to erect territorial governments? I, for one, believe that there is no express power delegated to Congress to form territorial governments; but the government owning a Territory—a large extent of country—with no government organize i over it, and owning the public land as property, Congress prescribes the rules under which that country may be settled, and afterwards provides for the sale of the lands. Then, sir, in accordance, I think, with the great principles of our government, preversed and carried out in all our constitutions, this law of Congress, called the organic law of the Territory, derive its vitality from the implied assent of the freemen who settle the Territory. The people who settle the Territory, under the rules and regulations of Congress, are the source of its vitality. Suppose, when the organic law of the Territory is passed, no one goes there to settle because of the reprincance of its provisions: what then becomes of your power?

I hold, Mr. Speaker, that in our government, taken in all its ramifications of State and fedgral relation, power

I hold, Mr. Speaker, that in our government, taken is

trics. What kind of doctrine is it? It is pure and the sections of the testes. I call on the republican party hold that Congress by exertificial engage power which they claim for Gongress over the Ferritor is the section. It is a power identical with that claimed by the Deciaration of It is power in the government of the Tritories. The British government of the Tritories. The British government of the government of the Tritories. The British government of the Tritories. The British government of the government of the Tritories. The British government of the government of the Tritories. The British government of the government of the the great principles of the government of the government of the the great principles of the government which imbodies the public and the great principles of the government of the the great principles of the government of

the hase cry of therty and freedom, claim the right he congress to govern the citizens of the Territories in all respects whatever without their consent.

But the power to govern the people residing in the Territories is vested somewhere. The power to form and regulate the domestic institutions in a Territory is not suspended nor in abeyance. To solve the question let us appear to the constitution, where we will find that—

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor problemed by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

"When admitted as a State or States, the said Territory or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Unie with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescrib at the time of their admission."

tality from the assent, implied or expressed, of the people under them.

Mr. H. MARSHALL. And not from Congress.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. Here, then, is this provision of the bill in reference to the legislative power of that Territory. It is a copy, word for word, and letter for letter, from the Utah and New Mexico bills of 1850—a part of the compromise measures of that year; and that very clause superseded the necessity of touching the Missouri Compromise, in my opinion, in the Kansas bill. The constitution of the United States does not prohibit the people of the Territory of Kansas from introducing slavery; nor did the Kansas bill pointit them. Then, if neither the constitution nor this act organizing the Territory—and which would become vital when the people should give their assent to it by organizing a government under it—prohibited its introduction by the people of Kansas through territorial action, your Missouri Compromise was not in the way, in my opinion, because the prohibition is not to be found either in the constitution or in the Kansas act.

Mr. H. MARSHALL. Will the gentleman allow me to make one remark?

Mr. H. MARSHALL. Will the gentleman and while to make one remark?

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will not interrupt me. I said nothing to him during the delivery of his speech, and I do not wish to be cate-hized on this occasion.

Mr. H. MARSHALL. I did not propose to catechize the gentleman. The gentleman did mg injustice, and I merely wished to make a remark to set the matter right.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. It was not my intention to do the gentleman injustice, and if I have I yield for correction.

rection.

Mr. H. MARSHALL. I stated in my remarks the other day, and I now state, this proposition: I said that the Utah and New Mexico bills gave vitality to the legisla-tures of those Territories upon the express ratification of Congress, but that the Kansas and Nebraska bill fails to

tures of those Territories upon the express rathication of Congress, but that the Kansas and Nebraska bill fails to do that in this particular. In the sixteenth section, I think it is, it interpolates, instead of the will of Congress to give the territorial legislation vitality, the doctrine of squatter so vareignty, which I denounce.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I ask the gentleman whether he does not endorse the Utah and New Mexico bills?

Mr. H. MARSHALL. I do.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I then ask the gentleman whether he does the right and power, upon the part of the people of the Territories of Utah or New Mexico, to repeal any law of Mexico prohibiting slavery in those Territories?

Mr. H. MARSHALL. If the gendeman wishes me to answer, I say that I hold the doctrine, that when that bill delegates to the people of this Territory the power and right to express the right to express the right to express their legislation, and that the legislature does not contain within itself the elegation of vitality.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman

for one will not vote to repeal their act or declare void; what the legislature of the Territory, with the sanction of the people, have done in the exercise of their rights. Now, sir, I say that the whole democratic party subscribe, as understand it, to the principle of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, that the legislature of a Territory—the legislature power of a Territory—shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislature, consistent with the constitution of the United States and the principles of that bill. We may differ as to what is constitutional power, but we do not represent that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This provision of the constitution disposes of all the powers necessary to be exercised under our forms of government, including that to form and regulate the domestic institutions of the territorial governments, slavery included. My friends of the South will agree with me, without an exception, that the power is not in Congress, and cannot be legitimately exercised by the legislative branch of the greenerst government. All will agree that it is not in

Institutions of the territorial governments, slavery included. My friends of the South will agree with me, without an exception, that the power is not in Congress, and cannot be legitimately exercised by the legislative branch of the general government. All will agree that it is not in the States, nor any one of them. No State can rightfully exercise power or authority beyond its defined limits. In the Health of the States, nor any one of them. No State can rightfully exercise power or authority beyond its defined limits. In not in the general or State government, it must either be in the people of the Territory or it is in abeyance. The clause of the constitution which I have read forbids the latter conclusion, and consequently I conclude that this power is in the people of the Territory, because it is nowhere delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor probibited by it to the people.

But, sir, I said that I believed the positive of the democratic party in the late contest, and at the present time, was equally clear with that of your own. And I will go not to the Clinging and platform, but to the Kansas-Nebraska act itself, to see what those principles are, and wherein those of us who belong to the democratic party disagree. The nineteenth section of the act organising the Territory of Kansas, after having prescribed the boundaries of what is to be the Territory of Kunsas, provides as follows:

"When admitted as a State or States, the said Territory,"

Now, sir, I take it that the democratic party agree upon

Now, sir, I take it that the democratic party agree upo

by Congress, and of the right of the people to govern themselves, and that each separate political community abound determinate the question for inself. For one, alsewholders as the second of the people to govern themselves, it is not that each separate political community abound determinate the question for inself. For one, alsewholders as the second of the people to govern themselves, it is not that each separate political community abound determinate the question for inself. It is not to the control of the people to govern themselves, it is not to the control of the people to govern themselves, it is not possible to the people of the people to govern themselves, it is not better the people of the people to govern themselves, it is not better the people of the people to govern themselves, it is not better the people of the people to govern the people to govern themselves, it is not better than the people to govern themselves, it is not better than the people to govern themselves, it is not better the people of the people to govern the find the people to govern themselves, and the subject vasual is there to all indicated the people of the people to govern the people of the people of the people to govern the people of the

prohibiting the existence of slavery in Kansas, declared that compromise inoperative and void; but, to exclude the conclusion that slavery would thereby have a legal existence in that Territory, it is declared in the act, as the truitont and meaning of those who passed it, not to legislate slavery into that Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom; and, as if to make assurances doubly sure, the Badger provise was incorporated into the act, which forbust the revival or putting in force any law or regulation for the establishment or protection of slavery therein, well knowing the utter impossibility of the existence of the institution in the absence of laws for its protection. If, then, slavery was excluded from Kansas by the Missouri Compromise, and Congress did not intend, and, in fact, did not so repeal that compromise as to legislate slavery into the Territory, and in express terms refused to revive or put in force any law or regulation for its protection, how, I ask, is the institution to have a legal existence in that Territory, except by the action of the people through their legislature? Or what has the South and the slaveholder gained by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act? My construction of the act, and understanding of the intentions or those who framed and paised the Kansas-Nebraska act, was neithe to prohibit or establish, nor to legislate slavery in the Territory, nor exclude it therefrom, but to remove all barriers and prohibitions out of the way of the people of the Territory, leaving them free to act as a majority should think best, and to establish or prohibit alsevery, as they should best, and to establish in prohibit alsevery, as they should riory, nor exclude it therefrom, but to remove all barriers and prohibitions out of the way of the people of the Territory, leaving them free to act as a majority should think best, and to establish or prohibit slavery, as they should determine. With this understanding of the powers of the people there, the legislature of Kansas passed laws at its first session protecting slaveholders in the possession and enjoyment of their property in slaves; and in the absence of all laws, the passage of laws recognising and protecting slavery is the establishing the institution. And thus it is that slavery has a legal existence in Kansas by the action of the legislature thereof. This our know-nothing adversaries call squatter sovereignty, which some of them denounce as worse than the black-republican doctrine of the avereign nower of Congress are the government of the Territory. I think it is the great principle of the right of the people to govern themselves, and under which slavery has been introduced into, and now exists in Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is, I think, a plain one, and easily comprehended. There are but two sides to it; the power and duty of Congress to govern the Territories, as contended for by the black republicans, and non-intervention by Congress in the domestic concerns and institutions of the Territories, and the right of the people therein to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States, as maintained by the democratic party. To deny the power of Congress over the subject and also the right of the people

icet only to the consocratic party. To deay the power of Congress over the subject, and also the right of the people in the Territory, as I understand some of the know-nothings to do, is as effectually to exclude southern men from the Territories with their property as the black-republican

prohibition in direct terms.

These, sir, are my opinions. I am aware that I differ with many of my democratic friends as to this abstract question; but there is one thing on which we all agree, and that is, that if the people of a Territory have this right under the constitution, we cannot and are not disposed to deprive them of it; and that, if they have not the right, then we cannot and are not disposed to give: to them. The democratic party, as I """ strength, stood in the recent contest on the great principle of non-intervention imbodied in the territorial bills of 1850 and 1854. We of the demoohibition in direct terms.

contest on the great principle of non-intervention imbodied in the territorial bills of 1250 and 1854. We of the demo-cratic party agree on this principle. Whether Congress has power or not, it shall not exercise it. Whether the people have the power to govern themselves or not, Congress shall not attempt to control them.

Mr. Speaker, I once voted for a proposition which does smack a little of this thing called squatter sovereignty. The democratic party, particularly of my section, with the great Carolinian at their head, I think, voted for it, too. The people of Oregon in 1845, some time before this government gave them any territorial organization, adopted what they called their organic or provisional government. The first article, section fourth, of that law is as follows:

"There shall be neither always nor invaluntary acquired."

"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in said Territory, otherwise than for the punishment of crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

After the conclusion of the war with Mexico, and the large acquisition of territory from that country, the subject of providing territorial governments for that acquisition, and also for Oregon, was referred to a select committee in the Senate, composed of eight senators, four from the North and four from the South, including Mr. Calhoun. That committee, with great if not entire unantizity, through its chairman, John M. Chayton, of Delaware, reported a bill for the organization of territorial governments in Oregon, California, and New Mexico, commonly called "the Clayton Compromise." That bill contained this provision:

ton Compromise." That bill contained this provision:

"Suc. 12. That the existing laws now in force in the Territory of Oregon, under the authority of the previsional
government established by the people thereof, shall continue
to be valid and operative therein, so far as the same be not
incompatible with the constitution and the provisions of this
act, for three months after the first meeting of the legislature
in said Territory; subject, nevertheless, to be altered, modified, or repealed by the legislative assembly of the said Territory of Oregon; and the constitution and laws of the
United States are hereby extended over and declared to be in
force in said Territory, so far as the same, or any provision
thereof, may be applicable."

of kansas, after having freedrichs the Continuation of Manias of the Continuation of the State of States, the said Territory, is to be the Territory of Kansas, provides as of clows:

"When admitted as State or States, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the United States of the Continuation of Internation of Intern

the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section twenty-seven, after providing for the establishment of a supreme court, district courts, probate courts, and justices of the peace, enacts that—

"Writs of error, bills of exception, and appeals, shall be allowed in all cases from the final decisions of said district courts to the supreme court, under such regulations as may be prescribed by law; but in no case removed to the supreme court shall trial by jury be allowed in said court."

"Writs of error, and appeals from the final decisions of said supreme court, shall be allowed, and may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, in the same manner, and under the same regulations, as from the circuit courts of the United States, when the value of the property in controversy, or the amount in controversy—to be ascertained by the oath or affirmation of either party, or other competent witnesses—shall exceed \$1,000; except only, that in all cases involving title to slaves, the said writs of error, or appeals, shall be allowed and decided by said supreme court, without regard to the value of the matter, property, or title in controversy; and except, also, that a writ of error, or appeals, shall also be allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the act as a preme court created by this act, or of any judge thereof, or of the district courts created by aids act, or of any judge thereof, upon any writ of habets corpus, involving the question of personal freedom."

Suppose the people of Kansas should prohibit slavery white they are in a territorial condition, and some one dissatisfied with that action should take the question up to the Supreme Court of the United States, through the territorial courts, and that court should decide that the people in the Territories were not prohibited by the constitution, but have a valid and constitutional power to prohibit slavery in the Territory: is there a democrat here who would be for agitating and overthrowing that decision of the judicial power of the country? On the other hand, if the people believe they have a right to introduce the institution into the Territory, and should pass laws for that purpose, and some gentleman dissatisfied with that, and thioking the people had exceeded their power, should take the case to the judicial tribunals of the country for adjudication and determination, and the Supreme Court should decide that the people of a Territory have a right to establish the institution of slavery there, then the democratic party, as a party, throughout the country, will acquiesce in that decision, in the same manner as they would if the Supreme Court should determine that there was no such power. Then, I say, there is no such difference of opinion in the democratic party as should cause any objection to them. We have rested the question as to the time when the people may determine this question for themselves with them and with the courts of a country.

But I understand that even those who cry squaster sovereints the analysis of the three when the people of a Territory have a right, when the people of a Territory have a right, when the people of a Territory have a right, when the manner of doing it, and not the thorn way; and they say that the same men can do it to-morrow by framing a State constitution, to determine whether they will have slavery or not. Am I correct in that position and understanding of what they had to be the correct doctrine upon this subject? If so, there may be not more than the subject of the Suppose the people of Kansas should prohibit slavery

tion of the United States.

I believe, sir, that there are but three questions in regard to which the subject of alavery should be introduced or mentioned in this hall, or in the other wing of the Capitol. One is the producion of the African slave trade from 1805 on. That trade was prohibited, and by the laws of the country is an original to the subject of the country is a suppose that my certain to yield the floor to him was a want of courtesy upon my part. It was not so intended. I am not a practised debater in this body; and I feel com-That trade was prohibited, and by the laws of the country it is piracy for an American citizen to be engaged in it. By those laws I am willing to abide; and I think that the question should never have been introduced into this hall by any man, North or South, who was willing to abide by by any man, about or South, was was withing to actually the present legislation. Another is that in reference to the return of fugitives from labor escaping from the States where they are held into another State. The last is that in reference to the apportionment of representation, by which you are bound to regard five slaves as three persons.

I understand, strange as it may appear, that there are men in the North protesting to be learned and intelligent, and claiming to be statesmen, who say to their records that

and claiming to be statesmen, who say to their people that the slavebulder in the South has three votes for every five

15 april ou seach TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

The same of no person will be entered upon our books, unice

status subscribers may forward us money by letter, the postage which will be paid by us, and all risk assumed by ourselves in a

us of Congrues, and semi-weekly during the rece Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received on erms proportioned to the above annual rates.

\$\text{QCP-POSTMASTERS}\$ are authorized to act as our sgents; and by sending us rive DAILY subscribers, with \$50 enclosed, or rive SEMI-WHEKLY subscribers, with \$25 enclosed, will be en-

DEFERRED DEBATE.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

IN SENATE DECEMBER 8, 1856.

[IN CONTINUATION.]

The question pending being a motion to print a number of extra copies of the President's annual message—

Mr. TRUMBULL, of Illinois, said: I should not claim the indulgence of the Senate at all except that I desire to correct a misapprehension of the senator from Pennsylvania, which it would have been more appropriate to have corrected during his remarks if his courtesy had allowed me to do so; but, as it did not, I will endeavor to make the correction now.

me to do so; but, as it did not, I will endeavor to make the correction now.

He represented the bill of Mr. Dunn as establishing slavery in Kansas. I have that bill before me. It does no such thing. It contains no such provision; and it is a perversion, a misapprehension—I may say a total misapprehension—of the bill to make such a statement. It provides for the restoration of the Missouri Compromise that excluded slavery. Now, what is the clause upon which the senator from Pennsylvania, here in his place says that it senator from Pennsylvania, here in his place, says that it perpetuates slavery? I will read it. After providing for the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, the bill de-

"Provided, honever, That any person lawfully held to ser-vice in either of the said Territories shall not be discharged from such service by reason of such repeal, if such person shall be permanently removed from such Territory or Terri-tories prior to the first day of January, 1858."

This provision is, thet by reason of the repeal of that clause of the Kansus-Nebraska ball which had abrogated the Missouri Compromise, and the re-enactmen of that compromise, no person shall be discharged from his service. Did that cetablish slavery? It provides that this bill shall not free persons if they are lawfully held to service. Cannot the senator from Pennsylvania see the difference between a provision that the bill should not set free any one lawfully held to service and a provision which makes a freeman a glave?

Mr. PUGH. I ask the senator from Illinois to read that portion of the proviso immediately f. ilowing what he has

ortion of the provise immediately f. ilowing what he has

aready read.

Mr. TRUMBULL, i will read it: "And any child or finale." aiready read.

Mr. TRUMBULL, i will read it: "And any child or children bor, in either of said Territories of any female law any held to service, if, in like manner, removed without said Territory before the expiration of that date, shall not, by reason of anything in this act, be emancipated from any service it might have owed had this act never been passed." It provides that the bill shall not free a person lawfully held in service; but it does not make a slave of anybody. Is not the distinction as palpable as the noonday sun between a law which makes a slave of a free person and a law which declares that by reason of its pagasge no person lawfully held to service shall be freed? Every one can see that. I say it is a total misrepresentation of the bill to say that these clauses perpetuate or make a slave of a single human being for a single day. I would ask the senator from Ohio (Mr. Pven) whether, if a question came up in a court of justice as to the freedom of a person in Kansas under that bill, he would insist that this clause, which declared that the bill should not make them free made them slaves? His reputation as a lawyer would not allow him to advance such a proposition for a moment.

Mr. PUGH. If the senator will allow me to make a suc-

moment.

Mr. PUGH. If the senator will allow me to make a suggestion in this connexion, I will tell how I interpret that bill. If there is any validity in it at all, it prevents the territorial legislature from emancipating those very chil-

dren.

Mr. TRUMBULL. It provides no such thing. It says that "by reason of this act;" it does not say what the territorial legislature shall do, but that by reason of the passage of this act, or anything contained in it, no one shall be emancipated from any service he might have owed if it had never been passed. It is a perversion of this bill to say that it establishes slavery; and the senator from frantsylvania, when he was making that broad statement, had either not examined it, or misapprehended it if he had examined it,

examined it,

M. BIGLER. Will the senator read the whole section?

Mr. TRUMBULL. I have read that portion of the section which relates to the subject. The section is a very long one, and it does not affect what I have read. The other portion of the section I will state, and the senator can refer to it and read it. The section commences by declaring that the fourteenth and thirty-second sections of the Kansas-Nebraska act, which are the sections repealing the Missouri Compromise, are themselves repealed: and then Maisses-Nebraska act, which are the sections repealing the Missouri Compromise, are themselves repealed; and then goes on to make the provisos I have read. It repeals in so many words, copying into the section what is contained in the Kansas-Nebraska act repealing the Missouri Compromise, and then contains the proviso which I have read, deviaring that, in consequence of abrogating the repealing clause of the Kansas-Nebraska act, no person lawfully held to service shall be discharged; but it does not make a slave of anybody.

clear, and I think well understood—as much so, at least, as those of the party to which you. Mr. Speaker, belong.

Non-intervention on the part of Congress is the only ground, in my opinion, upon which the country can remain a union, and have peace and aarmony through all its borders, and be free from agitation and excitement upon this question. It is the ground that Congress shall not interfere with the domestic institutions of a State or of a Territory, but that the people of both States and Territory but that the candidates of the republice a party for President were taken from the complaint of sectionalism; and the complaint of sectionalism; and the complaint of

want of courtesy upon my lam not a practised debater in this body; and I feel compelled to avoid interruption, lest I lose the thread of my discourse. That was the motive, and the only one. I am confident that the senator will do me justice in reference to what I said of a sectional party. I did not say that the circumstance of taking both candidates from the North what I said of a sectional party. I did not say that the circumstance of taking both candidates from the North made a sectional party. I was describing what was a sectional party, and in that descrip ion, with very many other things, I mentioned the circumstance that the republican party had both their candidates from the North; but I certainly did not state that isolated fact, and upon that alone claim that the party was sectional.

Mr. TRUMBULL. My interruption of the senator was certainly not designed to confuse him at all; and I do not know that I should have been led to use the remark which i made if the fact had not transcript here that the secator.

men in the North protesting to be learned and intelligent, and claiming to be statesmen, who say to their people that the slavebalder in the Soath has three votes for every five states the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states that the processes. The processes of the processes of the processes of the processes. That argues an ignorance upon to the states of the processes of the processes of the processes of the processes. That argues an ignorance upon the states of the processes of the pr